

United Heckathorn Stakeholder Meeting Summary
Thursday, October 4, 2007
9:00 am – 10:30 am
US EPA Region 9 Office
75 Hawthorn Street, San Francisco

Attendees:**US EPA:**

Sharon Lin
 Roberta Blank
 John Lyons
 Brian Ross
 Ned Black

CH2M HILL:

Julie Spahn
 Tamara Davis (E2
 Engineers, Inc.)
 Heidi Howerton (E2
 Engineers, Inc.)

NOAA:

Laurie Sullivan

DTSC:

Patrick Lee

US Fish and Wildlife:

John Henderson

**US Army Corps of
Engineers:**

Robert Lawrence

BCDC:

Max Delaney

**Levin-Richmond
Terminal Cooperation
(LRTC)**

Jim Cannon
 Gary Levin

**Cooper, White and
Cooper on behalf of
LRTC:**

Keith Howard

**Latham & Watkins on
behalf of Montrose
Chemical:**

Richard Raushenbush

Shell Oil Co.:

Kim Lesniak

**Geosyntec on behalf of
Shell Oil Co.:**

Carolyn Kneibler

I. Introductions & Announcements

Following Sharon's introductions, the attendees described their role and involvement with the UH Site. Sharon then defined the boundaries of the Site and referred to the Site Location poster and handout The Site, for purposes of this meeting, incorporates the Lauritzen Channel and Parr Canal.

The agenda was reviewed, and the purpose of the meeting was summarized as follows:

- a. Update stakeholders on activities and information since the last stakeholder meeting in 2005.
- b. Update stakeholders on anticipated activities for the coming year.

II. UH Site Review

See project presentation, handouts and poster materials on the United Heckathorn project Quickplace: <https://epaqpx.rtp.epa.gov/QuickPlace/unitedheckathornsuperfundproject/>

The presentation started with a review of the project timeline, as illustrated in the presentation slides. Sharon reviewed the two Five-Year Review Reports that have been completed to date. The first Five-Year Review was published in 2001 and reviewed data

collected from 1997 –2001. This review found the remedial goals had not been maintained. The key finding from this report found remedial action objectives had not been maintained. The second Five-Year Review was published in 2006 and included data collected from 2001 –2004 and the Phases I, II and III Source Investigations. The data from these investigations resulted in the plugging of concrete outfall pipes along the eastern embankment. Additionally, data from these reports were used to update the Conceptual Site Model.

III. Sediment Investigations

Julie Spahn reviewed the quantitative results of post-remedial action sediment sampling, as presented in the presentation slides. Julie next reviewed the DDT concentrations detected in the sediment of the eastern embankment, collected as part of the phased source investigations.

Questions/Comments

A question was asked regarding how the remedial goal for sediment was met in 1997 with a concentration of DDT detected as high as 1,318 µg/kg. Julie explained that the remedial goal is based on an average of sediment concentrations. Ned Black explained that, historically, sediment goals were based solely on average concentrations, but subsequent to methods applied in the United Heckathorn ROD, more current methods for establishing sediment goals include a “not-to-exceed” value in addition to an average value.

A question was asked regarding why the post-remedial action eastern embankment sediment/soil DDT concentrations were not averaged for comparison to the remedial action goal. Julie explained that these sediment concentrations were not averaged because they were part of a source investigation and were biased toward one area of the channel.

IV. Water and Mussel Tissue Monitoring

Julie reviewed the mussel and water tissue data collected through 2003. The concentrations of DDT and dieldrin in water from post-remedial action monitoring indicate concentrations above the remedial goal of 0.059 ng/L at several of the post-remediation biomonitoring stations. For the mussel tissue data, a decreasing trend is indicated at the station within the Inner Richmond Harbor, but not at stations within the Lauritzen Channel. Mussel tissue data therefore are not in compliance with ROD requirements.

Questions/Comments

A question was asked regarding the availability of the 2007 data. John Lyons responded that no data would be released until validation was completed.

A question was asked regarding whether Parr Canal was sampled and why the data trends did not include the Parr Canal. Julie responded that water and sediment samples were collected during 2007 in the Parr Canal; however there were not sufficient data to illustrate a post-remedial action trend (at the time of the meeting, only data from one post-remedial sampling event with validated data had been published).

V. Focused Feasibility Study Strategy Development

The strategy of developing the Focused Feasibility Study was discussed, as presented in the presentation slides. The Data Management figure was reviewed to describe the process of managing data collected in support of the Focused Feasibility Study. Julie presented the draft Conceptual Site Model, and stated the importance of receiving feedback from stakeholders.

Julie noted that, in 2007, resident mussel, water, and sediment data were collected at locations within the Lauritzen Channel, Parr Canal, Santa Fe Channel, and Inner Richmond Harbor as part of a Data Gaps Investigation. Current field sampling plans include the sampling of sediment from within storm drainage structures that discharge to storm drain outfalls at the northern ends of the Lauritzen Channel and Parr Canal. Both storm drain lines will be investigated at points above tidal influence and when sufficient sediment has been collected. In 2006, the City of Richmond conducted periodic storm drain cleaning and maintenance and removed sediment within the storm drainage lines of interest. Therefore, storm drains and their utilities are being monitored to identify accumulation of sediment. This sediment will then be collected and tested for DDT constituents. Outfalls along the eastern embankment were considered sources before and were investigated. The municipal outfalls have not been investigated above tidal influence.

Julie explained the data set with which analyses and conceptual site design drafts are being developed incorporate only post-remedial action data.

Julie explained that one objective of the 2007 Data Gaps Field Investigation was to establish current baseline concentrations of DDT and dieldrin in water and mussel tissue.

Questions/Comments

A question was asked regarding whether dieldrin had met the remedial action goals. The answer was “no” for the water samples collected as part of the post-remediation biomonitoring program.

Julie explained the Conceptual Site Model is dynamic and considered draft, and EPA welcomes comments and input from stakeholders.

VI. Planned 2007-2008 Activities

Sharon Lin reviewed the upcoming activities scheduled for 2007-2008, as presented in the presentation slides. She reported that mussel tissue, water, and sediment sampling had been performed and results are pending data validation. Fish sampling is currently scheduled for late 2007 and will provide data to update human health and ecological risk assessments. The current risk assessments were completed in the early 1990s (prior to ROD), and updating them will set a current risk baseline for the alternatives to be examined by the EPA. The information will help EPA to set a site specific risk based remediation goals and cleanup levels.

Questions/Comments

Sharon requested comments on the Conceptual Site Model by the first week of November. Finalizing the Conceptual Site Model is critical for completing additional risk and remedial activities.

The question was asked if the ROD was being redone. John Lyons responded that the results from the updated risk assessments will be used to determine if a ROD reissuance or amendment is warranted. John Lyons noted that there will be opportunity for comments on EPA proposed course of action, including no further action.

VII. Feasibility Study Process

Sharon summarized the feasibility study process, as presented in the presentation slides. This process includes developing the scope of the Focused Feasibility Study, evaluating risks, developing and screening remedial alternatives, and developing a detailed analysis of the alternatives.

VIII. Closing Comments/Next Steps

EPA will e-mail project updates to stakeholders and will schedule more frequent meetings.

The timing of the Focused Feasibility Study will depend on the completion of the risk assessment updates and their results.

A question was asked regarding why no remedial or mitigation action had taken place over the last 5 to 6 years following detections of high DDT concentrations in the embankment sediment. John Lyons responded that if the PRPs would like to propose a plan for remediation as a proactive approach, EPA would review it. John explained that the focus has been on investigating all the sources to ensure future remedial activities are comprehensive. However, this focus is open for discussion, and stakeholders are encouraged to provide input.

A comment was made regarding the remediation goal in the ROD didn't adequately take into account of actual risk information at the site.

The question was asked regarding whom will conduct the fish sampling. EPA will collect the fish samples, the laboratory analyses will be performed by a qualified laboratory,

EPA will carry out data validation, CH2M HILL will update the risk assessment calculation, EPA will perform the final review of the risk assessment.

Figures depicting the storm drain system were presented in the Data Gaps Field Investigation Sampling and Analysis Plan and will be made available.

John Lyons stated that EPA wants the process moving forward to be transparent to the stakeholders and EPA looks forward to creating a more integrated and collaborative process for the next phases of the project.

A request was made for more project meetings, especially in conjunction with preparation of major documents.

EPA can make the Data Gaps Field Investigation Sampling and Analysis Plan available to the stakeholders.

The question was asked if EPA will attempt to recover all costs for the project. John Lyons responded that Superfund has absorbed the costs of the post-remedial monitoring. It is too early to tell if costs of activities moving forward will be absorbed in a similar way or if cost recovery will be approached in another way.

A comment was made regarding concern of the presence of suspended sediment and whether suspended sediment will be considered in design of dredging activities, should dredging activities occur. The response was that suspended sediment is being considered a source and will be incorporated into the remedial design, even though it is not classified as a fluid mud.

EPA Action Items:

1. Establish a project site to share information with stakeholders - completed
2. Provide SAP and QAPP to stakeholders - completed
3. Publish validated data for 2007 sampling event
4. Schedule and communicate quarterly meetings for stakeholders
5. Distribute stakeholder presentation slides, sign-in sheet, and meeting minutes - completed

Stakeholder Action Item:

1. Provide input on Conceptual Site Model to EPA by the first week of November.

United Heckathorn Stakeholders Meeting Attendees List (October 4, 2007)

Name	Organization	Address	e-mail	Telephone
Sharon Lin	EPA - Superfund	75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	lin.sharon@epa.gov	(415) 972-3446
Roberta Blank	EPA - Superfund	75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	blank.roberta@epa.gov	(415) 972-3169
John Lyons	EPA - ORC	75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	lyons.john@epa.gov	(415) 972-3889
Brian Ross	EPA - Water	75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	Ross.brian@epa.gov	(415) 972-3475
Ned Black	EPA - Superfund technical suport	75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	black.ned@epa.gov	(415) 972-3055
Julie Spahn	CH2MHILL - EPA contractor	155 Grand Ave. Suite 1000, Oakland, CA 94612	julia.spahn@ch2m.com	(510) 587-7637
Tamara Davis	CH2MHILL /E2 - EPA contractor	155 Grand Ave. Suite 1000, Oakland, CA 94612	tamara.davis@ch2m.com	(510) 587-7571
Heidi Howerton	CH2MHILL/E2 - EPA contractor	155 Grand Ave. Suite 1000, Oakland, CA 94612	heidi.howerton@ch2m.com	(510) 587-7562
Laurie Sullivan	NOAA - trustee	75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	laurie.sullivan@noaa.gov	(415) 972-3210
Patrick Lee	DTSC	700 Heintz Ave. Berkeley, CA	Patrick.Lee <PLee1@dtsc.ca.gov>	(510) 540-3847
John Henderson	US Fish and Wildlife	2800 Cottage way Rm 2605, Sacramento, CA 95825	john_henderson@fws.gov	(916) 414-6595
Robert Lawrence	US Army Corps of Engineers	1455 Market Street, 16th floor, san francisco, CA 94103	robert.j.lawrence@sp02.usace.army.mil	(415) 503-6808
Max Delaney	BCDC	50 California Street, Suite 2600, San Francisco, CA 94111	maxd@bcdc.ca.gov	(415) 352-3668
Jim Cannon	Levin-Richmond Terminal Cooperation	402 Wright Ave. Richmond	jim.cannon@levinterminal.com	(510) 307-4020
Gary Levin	Levin-Richmond Terminal Cooperation	402 Wright Ave. Richmond	garyl@levinterminal.com	(510) 307-4091
Keith Howard	Cooper, White and Cooper - LRTC	1333 N. California blvd, Walnut Creek, CA	khoward@cwclaw.com	(925) 935-0700
Richard Raushenbush	Latham & Watkins - Montrose Chemical	505 Montgomery Street Suite 2020, san francisco, CA 94111	richard.raushenbush@lw.com	(415) 395-8237
Kim Lesniak	Shell Oil Co	P. O. Box 2463, Houston, TX 77252-2463	kim.lesniak@shell.com	(713) 241-5403
Carolyn Kneibler	Geosyntec - Shell consultants	475 14th Street, Suite 460, Oakland, CA 94612	ckneibler@geosyntec.com	(510) 285-2724

United Heckathorn Superfund Site Stakeholders Update Meeting
USEPA Region 9
Hawaii/Palau Conference room
1st floor
75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA
9:00-noon, October 4, 2007

Overall Purpose:

- (1) Provide updates on site related activities in 2005-2007
- (2) Discuss general planned activities in 2007-2008

Agenda:

- 9:00-9:30 Welcome, introductions and agenda review
- 9:30-10:30 Overall site activities update & clarifying questions
 - Summary of post remediation activities
 - Conceptual site model
 - Scoping and field sampling activities
- 10:30-10:45 Break
- 10:45-11:30 General planned activities in 2007-2008 & clarifying questions
 - Refine conceptual site model
 - Update risk assessment
 - Develop risk based site specific cleanup levels and remediation goals
 - Prepare a focused feasibility study
- 11:30-noon Closing and next steps